



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a valid generic character by most authorities. The absence of a sagittal crest in *Tapirus bairdii* and the molariform structure of the second superior premolar, a character which is found in other species of *Tapirus*, can hardly be considered of generic value.

The relations of the American and European species of fossil tapir have been very fully discussed by Wortman* and Earle, and since their paper was written I have studied the original types of *Protapirus* occurring in the Eocene and Oligocene of France. I see no reason in changing the conclusions stated by these authors. The opinion† has been advanced that the fossil tapir from the Lower Miocene of St. Gérard-le-Puy, in France, was really a species of the American genus *Colodon*. I strongly dissent from this idea, as, after having examined the original type of *Protapirus douvillei*, I can confidently state that it is a true tapir and not very closely related to *Colodon*. Again, *Protapirus priscus* of the Phosphorites belongs in the same genus as the remains of the animal from St. Gérard-le-Puy. As the Phosphorites is 'un grand mélange,' the position stratigraphically of the French species of *Protapirus* is about the same; the Phosphorites probably including the space of time, between the Upper Eocene, Gypse de Paris, and the Lower Miocene or Oligocene, of St. Gérard-le-Puy. As the evidence now stands I can see no reason for burdening paleontological literature with another new name for the American forms of *Protapirus*.

In my opinion there is ample proof to show that the American genus *Hyrachyus* occurs in the Middle Eocene of France, Argenton. Monsieur Filhol‡ has described a lower jaw with complete dentition and

also isolated upper molars, which agree structurally with those of the typical *Hyrachyus* of the Bridger.

In conclusion I do not see that Mr. Hatcher brings forward any new evidence to prove that the line of the true tapirs was not already in the Middle Eocene, Bridger, perfectly distinct from that of the pseudo-tapirs.

Osborn and Wortman have described the structure of the feet in *Heptodon calciculus* of the Wind River Eocene, and these authors have shown that in *Heptodon* the middle metapodial was already enlarged, as compared with the lateral metapodials, and this increase in size, tending to monodactylism, culminated in the genus *Colodon* of the White River Oligocene.

The ancestral form of the true tapir from the Bridger is not yet clearly made out, as the relationship of the two species of *Isectolophus* to the tapir phylum is rather obscure.

CHARLES EARLE.

NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.

ON THE OCCURRENCE OF *TROCHOSPHERA SOLSTITIALIS* IN THE ILLINOIS RIVER.

THIS interesting and remarkable rotifer occurred sparingly in collections made at the biological station of the University of Illinois during the months of June, July and August, in the summer of 1896, in the Illinois River at Havana, and in a permanent marsh in the adjacent bottom-lands locally known as Flag Lake. The species was described by Surgeon Thorpe, R. N., from collections made in August, 1892, in a pond near Wuhu, on the Yangtze-Kiang River. As its specific name indicates, it differs from *T. æquatorialis* Semper, in the position of the girdle of cilia. Semper's species, found in 1859 in the rice fields of the Phillipine Islands, was also rediscovered by Thorpe in 1889 in ponds of the Acclimatization Society at Brisbane, Australia. Of its occurrence elsewhere nothing

* Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., Aug., 1893.

† Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., Dec., 1895, p. 362.

‡ Mém. sur Lophiodon, Mém. Soc. Géol. de France, 1888, Tome V.

is known. The distribution of this genus, as hitherto reported, is thus clearly antipodal, and its occurrence in our inland waters is, therefore, of more than passing interest.

It is well known that many of our rotifers are cosmopolitan. Thus, at least two-thirds of the thirty-one species reported from Wuhu as associated with *Trochosphaera* are also found at Havana. Again, *Notholca longispina*, originally described by Prof. D. S. Kellicott, from the Niagara River, has since been found to have a wide distribution in Europe; *Rotifer mento* and Anderson, discovered at Calcutta in 1889, was found by Dr. Jennings in 1893 in great abundance in Lake St. Clair. It may then be that *Trochosphaera* also is a cosmopolitan form.

One circumstance, however, seems to militate against this view. *Trochosphaera* was not reported from any one of our 505 collections made from April 1, 1894, to May 13, 1896, in the Illinois River or its adjacent waters. A re-examination of the river collections prior to June, 1896, made especially for *Trochosphaera*, has been fruitless. Importation is thus suggested to account for its sudden appearance this year in the river at Havana. Rice straw and bamboo from the Orient were not uncommon at the World's Fair in Chicago in 1893, and it may be that they smuggled in our visitor from China. Mr. Thorpe, in a discussion this year before the Royal Microscopical Society of London, maintained that rotifers, in their distribution, seemed to follow the footsteps of man, and that those found in foreign countries which had been colonized were frequently of the same kind as those of the countries whence the immigrants originally came. He had found, in Australia, for example, "the most abundant material always in ornamental waters in botanical gardens and in the immediate precincts of civilization, and the forms were such as left no doubt that in some way or other they had been

introduced by the agency of man, for, as Dr. Hudson had remarked, a foot of salt water was as great a barrier to rotifers as an ocean."

Other agencies than the movements of man are beyond question active in the distribution of these minute members of the aquatic fauna. Their winter eggs are blown about in dust, it may be for considerable distances; or they may take passage on the feet or plumage of water-birds from distant lands. It is therefore but the merest conjecture to attribute the occurrence of *Trochosphaera* at Havana to introduction by man, especially in view of the paucity of information in regard to the minute fauna of our inland waters.

This preliminary note is published in the hope that it may lead to a wider knowledge of the distribution of this interesting member of the river plankton.

CHARLES A. KOFOID.

BIOLOGICAL STATION,
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

CURRENT NOTES ON ANTHROPOLOGY.

THE ENGLISH 'ROUND BARROW' STOCK.

Few questions in English archaeology are more difficult, and at the same time more important in the light their solution would throw on proto-history, than that relating to the people who built the 'round barrows' or graves. Their skulls are very much alike, highly brachycephalic, the parietal eminences projecting, the glabella and chin prominent.

Mr. C. S. Myers discusses them in an article on some old skulls from Suffolk, in the Journal of the Anthropological Institute, November, 1896. He says they were certainly not the Belgian Celts, as some have maintained. Possibly they were the neolithic Danes. But this only removes the difficulty, because we do not know to what stock these belonged. They might have been a branch of the round-headed 'Celts'